

REMARKS

In the Office Action of June 28, 2007, the abstract was objected to because it did not commence on a separate page. In addition, claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,714,032 B1 (hereinafter “Reynick”).

In response to the abstract objection, Applicants have amended the disclosure so that the abstract commences on a separate page. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the abstract objection be withdrawn.

In response to the rejections of claims 1-11, Applicants have amended the independent claims 1 and 11 to correct minor informalities. New claim 12 has also been added. Applicants respectfully assert that the amended independent claims 1 and 11 are not anticipated by the cited reference of Reynick, as explained below. In view of the claim amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of pending claims 1-12.

A. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 1 and 11

The amended independent claim 1 recites “*applying a plurality of different DC power supply voltages to a circuit or component under test,*” which is not disclosed in the cited reference of Reynick. Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Reynick.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The Office Action on page 3 alleges that the cited reference of Reynick “teaches applying a plurality of different DC power supply voltages to a circuit component under test” and cites column 6, lines 10-56, and column 11, lines 14-40, of Reynick in support of the alleged teaching. The cited passages of Reynick disclose applying a single “voltage stress” on a DUT. The “voltage stress” is described in a paragraph beginning at column 12, line 66, of Reynick. In short, a voltage stress as defined in Reynick is an electrical stimulus, which is substantially above the voltage range specified for normal operation, applied to the integrated circuit for a predetermined duration. Although the cited reference of Reynick describes changing the level and duration of the electrical stimulus (see column 13, lines 16-46), the cited reference of Reynick does not disclose applying **multiple different** electrical stimuli on the integrated circuit. Thus, the cited reference of Reynick does not disclose “*applying a plurality of different DC power supply voltages to a circuit or component under test,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 1.

The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claim 11, which recites similar limitations as those of the amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the amended independent claim 11 is also not anticipated by the cited reference of Reynick, and request that this amended independent claim be allowed as well.

B. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-10 and 12

Each of the dependent claims 2-10 and 12 depends on the amended independent claim 1. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of the amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the amended independent claim 1.

As an example, the dependent claim 4 recites “*the step of providing a single supply voltage means and ramping said supply voltage up to attain each of said selected power supply voltages, prior to measurement of the quiescent current,*” which is not disclosed in the cited reference of Reynick. The cited passage (column 13, lines 25-58) of Reynick describes changing the level and duration of the electrical

stimulus (voltage stress). However, the cited reference of Reynick does not disclose applying multiple different electrical stimuli on the integrated circuit. In particular, the cited reference of Reynick does not disclose “*ramping said supply voltage up to attain each of said selected power supply voltages, prior to measurement of the quiescent current,*” as recited in the dependent claim 4. Thus, the dependent claim 4 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Reynick.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Pineda De Gyvez et al.

Date: September 28, 2007

By: /thomas h. ham/
Thomas H. Ham
Registration No. 43,654
Telephone: (925) 249-1300